CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Conference Group for Central European History of the American Historical Association

From Amrum to Algiers and Back: The Reintegration of a Renegade in the Eighteenth Century
Author(s): Martin Rheinheimer
Source: *Central European History*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (2003), pp. 209-233
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of Conference Group for Central European History of the American Historical Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4547299
Accessed: 15-07-2016 16:08 UTC

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
http://www.jstor.org/stable/4547299?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://about.jstor.org/terms

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press, Conference Group for Central European History of the American Historical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Central European History*

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

From Amrum to Algiers and Back: The Reintegration of a Renegade in the Eighteenth Century

Martin Rheinheimer

IN the year 1724, fifteen-year-old Hark Olufs sailed on the ship the *Hoffnung* (Hope), half of which was owned by his father and the other half by Ricklef Flor, the captain. The ship was sailing under the flag of Hamburg although the entire crew consisted of Danish subjects: three came from Amrum, as did Hark, one from the neighboring island of Föhr, three from the Elbe. The ship was sailing from Nantes to Hamburg to unload its cargo.[1] Although these waters were considered to be safe, the *Hoffnung* was seized by a "Turkish" privateer near the Scilly Isles and towed to Algiers.

During the early modern period, contemporaries referred to Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli as the Barbary Coast. These countries stood outside the Western, Christian community of international law. The piracy they practiced has been likened to the Jihad.[2] The state of war with the Western states gave formal legitimacy to the privateering common during wartime. In fact, economically the states of the Barbary Coast were dependent on the booty they acquired in trading goods, war materiel, ships and (slave) labor. In the city of Algiers, which had roughly 100,000 residents, various sources indicate that in the mid-seventeenth century between 8,000 and 40,000 of them were slaves.[3] Privateering was thus an integral part of the economic life of the Mediterranean as is evidenced by the fate of the *Hoffnung*.[4] The danger to Western shipping was not limited to the Mediterranean, but also existed in the western Atlantic

1. See RAK Danske Kancelli, D 109, supplikprotokol 1724, no. 527. Detailed report: Martin Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn: Hark Olufs's Wiederkehr aus der Sklaverei* (Neumünster, 2001) (including a critical edition of Hark Olufs's autobiography). Archives are abbreviated as follows: LAA = Landsarkivet for Sønderjylland, Aabenraa; RAK = Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen.

2. Jörg Manfred Mössner, *Die Völkerrechtspersönlichkeit und die Völkerrechtspraxis der Barbaresken-staaten (Algier, Tripolis, Tunis 1518–1830)* (Berlin, 1968), 169–70.

3. Stephen Clissold, *The Barbary Slaves* (London, 1992), 53–54; Robert C. Davis, "Counting European Slaves on the Barbary Coast," in *Past and Present* 172 (2001): 87–124.

4. Fernand Braudel, *Das Mittelmeer und die mediterrane Welt in der Epoche Philipps II.* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990), 2: 722–24.

Central European History, vol. 36, no. 2, 209–233

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

up to the Irish and French coasts. From 1716 to 1754, nineteen Danish-Norwegian ships with 208 crew members on board were captured.[5] The sailors taken into custody were considered prisoners of war according to the tenets of Moslem law. They were sold and often cruelly treated, becoming slaves by Western standards whose only salvation was to be ransomed by their families. Enslaving prisoners and extorting ransom money, however, was found not only among Muslims, but among Christians as well.

Hark Olufs was sold to a private citizen at the slave market in Algiers for 1000 Lübeck marks; one day later he was resold to another, at a profit of 100 marks,with whom he stayed for only about fourteen days. "However, since the Constantine Bey, named Assin, had his trading agent buying slaves in Algiers," he later recalled, "he took a fancy to me and my patron gave me to him for 450 pieces of eight."[6] All the attempts made by his father to ransome his son proved futile in the following years,[7] and Hark Olufs did not return to his island home until twelve years later.

The trading agent of the Constantine Bey had good reasons for wanting to buy young Hark Olufs. Ever since the fourteenth century, the Ottoman sultans had been recruiting Christian children between the ages of eight and twenty for their Janissary Guards.[8] Of the renegades whom Bartholomé and Lucile Bennassar found in the archives of Lisbon, Madrid, Las Palmas, and Venice (the age of a respectable 978 of whom could be determined), 55.5 percent were less than fifteen years old when taken into slavery and 78.4 percent were under twenty.[9] These children could still be formed, and their master could function as a father to them. This made them more loyal than the average mercenaries. Accordingly, the goal of the Turkish and North African rulers was not achieved until a young, Christian captive converted to Islam and allowed himself to be deployed against the indigenous population and against Christian states.

We must distinguish between the requirements of a political strategy marked by war and religious conflict, and the reality on both sides of those involved. Especially for young people or children captured in raids, who as yet knew so little about their Christian religion, the contrast between Christianity and Islam

5. Erik Gøbel, "De algierske søpasprotokoller: En kilde til langfarten 1747–1840," in *Arkiv* 9 (1982/83): 66–108, here 77.

6. *Harck Olufs aus der Insul Amron im Stifte Ripen in Jütland, gebürtig, sonderbare Avanturen, so sich mit ihm insonderheit zu Constantine und an andern Orten in Africa zugetragen* (Flensburg, 1751), 4–5. "Pieces of eight" are Spanish 8 Real coins. For reasons of comprehensibility and smooth reading, quotes from the sources included in the normal text have been translated from the originals or original publications and modernized. For the original text refer to the sources mentioned in the footnotes.

7. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 28–30.

8. See V. L. Ménage, "Devshirme", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, (Leiden, 1983), 2:210–13, here 211; Bartholomé and Lucile Bennassar, *Les Chrétiens d'Allah: L'histoire extraordinaire des renégats: XVIe–XVIIe siècles* (Paris, 1989), 283–88.

9. Bennassar/Bennassar, *Chrétiens*, 267–68. For German and Scanidinavian renegades see ibid., 186–88.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

was less great than was proclaimed by the ideology of the Western states and churches, or for that matter the reports of slaves after their return to Europe;[10] one could even assume that the Western official position was so rigid specifically to prevent conversions. The ease of conversion and the fluid boundaries between Islam and Christianity in practical life — as shown by the return of many renegades — must have appeared, in Christian countries, as a threat to the fixed order of the world.

First Hark Olufs served the Bey as a lackey and during this time learned the linguae francae, Turkish and Arabic.[11] It was a sort of apprenticeship, during which he was gradually familiarized with the foreign country, the distinct culture, the structures of domination, and the coming tasks. To this end, he was occasionally entrusted with special tasks that gave him the opportunity to prove himself. After three and a half years, that is, in 1727–28, when Olufs had successfully discharged some important tasks for his master, he rose to the position of "Gassenadahl or Gasnadi," which he himself translates as "chief cashier."[12] According to Vayssettes's description of the administrative structures, Olufs was thereafter in charge of supervising the convoys that transported tax money, as well the soldiers' pay and, when the Bey was in the field, the beasts of burden needed to carry supplies.[13] Hark Olufs proved to be an able Gasnadal, and the Bey further entrusted him with a "command of five hundred horses." This made him, in his own words, the head of the Bey's bodyguard.[14] As commander of the guard, Olufs was the man to handle the rough work. Especially in the final years, the aging Bey liked to see "things disposed of" by Olufs. He had been Gasnadal for four years when his career took its next leap, probably in 1732. The reign of the Bey of Constantine also covered many Berber clans that enjoyed considerable internal autonomy. One of the largest clans were the Henanesha under Sheikh Bu Aziz ben Nasser. In one of the battles with Bu Aziz, Olufs was able to score a surprise victory with his five hundred riders. For this success, he was appointed commander of the entire cavalry, a position he called "Laga di Dejra," which he translated as "Colonel of the Cavalry."[15] The agha ed-deïra was one of the highest officials. Vayssettes describes his tasks as follows: "He was one of the heads of the riders of the Makhzen. He had command over the troops of the indigenous clans in the countryside and was responsible for everything pertaining to these irregular troops. He administered thirty-nine clans and had special flags. Often he was entrusted with

10. Ibid.
11. Olufs 1751, 12.
12. Ibid.
13. E. Vayssettes, *Histoire de Constantine sous les beys depuis l'invasion turque jusqu'à l'occupation française 1535–1837* (Constantine, 1869), 13 and 10.
14. Olufs 1751, 13–14.
15. Ibid., 16.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

minor expeditions to punish specific clans."[16] Olufs mentions that in this position he was "saddled with much hate and contempt."[17] On the one hand he had to deal with the envy of the other slaves and renegades, and on the other the Turkish dominion frequently used renegades to oppress and plunder the local population — which did not exactly increase their popularity.

A career such as Olufs made in Constantine would hardly have been conceivable without him converting to Islam — even if he always denied this later. His marriage and a trip to Mecca (which was forbidden to all infidels) point in any case to considerable integration in North Africa, and most likely to his conversion to Islam.[18]

The impending death of the by now aged Bey finally endagered Olufs's life in Constantine, since he had to expect a successor to purge the entourage of his predecessor "for the money," as was usual in North Africa, and death was often the result for those displaced.[19] No small number of renegades returned to Christianity after the death of a master of whom they had grown fond.[20] Olufs thus secretly prepared his escape, but his plan was not realized. During the battles with the Bey of Tunis, the army of the Bey of Constantine was cut off from reinforcements, and because the Tunisian troops were stronger than his own, a direct attack appeared too dangerous. Hence the Bey decided to send a spy, Olufs, to the camp of the Bey of Tunis in order to discover the latter's strength. The Bey promised him his freedom upon his return. Indeed, after succesfully carrying out his mission, he was shortly thereafter set free. The Tunisian camp was taken on 4 September 1735, and Olufs's gravestone (the dates on which, however, are never quite exact) names 31 October 1735 as the day of his release.

Olufs now traveled by way of Marseille, Lyon, and Paris back to Hamburg. There he was met by his father, Oluf Jensen, who no longer recognized his son. The repatriate had become a foreigner. "He had not seen me since I was a boy of fourteen, but now I had grown and filled out, and was dressed in delicate clothing."[21] On 25 April 1736, Hark Olufs is said finally to have landed "in his fatherland," the island of Amrum.[22] He brought back with him "a wealth of rare clothes, furnishings, and ready money."[23]

Although there is no evidence that Hark Olufs converted to Islam, this was presumed on Amrum as soon as he returned, since otherwise what he had experienced appeared to be scarcely possible. The return of a renegade posed

16. Vayssettes, *Constantine*, 10–11, 31; Ernest Mercier, *Histoire de Constantine* (Constantine, 1903), 214.
17. Olufs 1751, 16.
18. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 60–62, 75.
19. Olufs 1751, 41.
20. See Bennassar/Bennassar, *Chrétiens*, 335, 443–46.
21. Olufs 1751, 47.
22. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 83 and n. 272.
23. Olufs 1751, 47.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

certain problems, not only for those returning, but also for the home community. In the following, I will use the example of Hark Olufs to study the course that the reintegration of a renegade from Islamic countries into the Protestant, Lutheran environment of the eighteenth century could follow. Thus, I will focus on three features that made his reintegration a success: 1) religious reintegration through the ritual of confirmation, 2) psychological reintegration through pastoral care, and 3) the writing of an autobiography. In a fourth section I will analyze aspects of missing reintegration: social problems he had in his further life and the collective assimilation of his return.

1. Confirmation

The expectations placed on a former slave who had returned home were obvious. They are reflected in the fixed pattern that the reports of former slaves normally follows: 1) the battle at sea against the bloodthirsty corsairs; 2) the trip to Algiers, the capital, to the Dey; 3) captivity marked by torments perpetrated on the slave by his master and his master's underlings; 4) in desperation, the captive is told to convert to Islam, but refuses; 5) emissaries obtain his release. As Morsy explains, these stages "gain meaning from the metaphysical code, from spiritual progress": the first step is the battle between the forces of good and evil, the second corresponds to the journey to hell, the third is a trial in which the victim is handed over to the devil and the devil's helpers so that in the fourth step the Christian value of patience is endangered. If he should surrender to the temptation, he would fall into evil through apostasy. In the fifth step, missionaries or messengers appear as envoys from God. The trial that the Christian must withstand comes to an end and he regains eternal salvation at the same time as he gains his freedom.[24]

This traditional expectation was now placed on Olufs. But his career had already violated it and he appeared not to have experienced his captivity as a trial of his faith. His entire behavior was ambivalent. On the one hand, he claimed to have remained a Christian, while on the other, he continued to go around in his Turkish clothing. In the later editions of his "Strange Adventures," the publisher noted the foreignness of the impression he made, "It seemed strange and foreign to me when I first saw him in his beautiful clothes, wearing a pair of Turkish slippers without stockings, and he drew tobacco smoke through his nose."[25] His appearance, therefore, contradicted the image people had of the unfortunate slave for whom Christian society could do a good deed by paying his ransom. As a renegade, his astounding rise to fame and fortune would have been plausible, but not as a Christian. This must be why doubts concerning his story arose on Amrum.

24. Magali Morsy, *La relation de Thomas Pellow: Une lecture du Maroc au 18e siècle* (Paris, 1983), 31.
25. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 83 and n. 274.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

The traumas of captivity had put their stamp on Olufs's behavior in North Africa. From the point of view of his native country, Hark Olufs had taken on a "negative" identity,[26] a role that was not desirable. The ruptures in the biography arising first from servitude and then from the return confronted him with psychological challenges for which the existing behavior patterns were insufficient. Captivity had created the problem of surviving in a hostile, foreign environment; the return now called for distancing himself from the identity gained in North Africa and the behavior patterns inherent in it. This could cause complete social overload. In the eighteenth century, one's occupation and values were determined within narrow boundaries, and were usually prescribed by one's parents (hence Hark Olufs, whose father was a captain, in turn became a sailor). Self-achieved identities, such as are possible today,[27] were hardly conceivable in such a world (even Olufs's African identity was not self-achieved, but rather forced upon him by circumstances). Accordingly, in his home environment, the possibility of further moral or religious development was limited. And even if someone had continued to develop, this would have put him outside the ability to communicate, and he would hardly have been able to tell his contemporaries, especially on an isolated island such as Amrum, of his own reality. The world of the repatriate and that of his native land were not compatible. Between their differing experiences and interpretative contexts, communication and mutual understanding were no longer possible.

Hark Olufs was left to his own devices when he returned, since no one was able to understand the harsh experiences of the foreign world he had left. He must have appeared to be a "cultural deserter,"[28] since his behavior in captivity had placed him outside the norms of his native society, and, moreover, he had returned as a rich man, while other seamen died in slavery or their families had to marshal their entire wealth for their ransom. Furthermore, a possible conversion to Islam disturbed the Christian order prevailing on the island of Amrum, and Olufs clearly showed that he stood outside native society by continuing to wear his Turkish clothing.

Of course, even back then practical life did not consist solely of ideology and stereotypes. The variety and powers of circumstances that could keep a person from following their ideals were well known. Beyond the ideology propagated for the sake of appearances people usually tended to be more pragmatic, and boundaries were not so strictly drawn. Reintegration was just as possible as

26. See Erik H. Erikson, *Identität und Lebenszyklus* (Frankfurt am Main, 1973), 163–68.

27. See Roy F. Baumeister, *Identity: Cultural Change and the Struggle for Self* (New York, 1986); Anthony Giddens, *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age* (Cambridge, 1991).

28. On the problem of identity of cultural deserters see Karl-Heinz Kohl, *Abwehr und Verlangen: Zur Geschichte der Ethnologie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1987), 7–38. On the problems of reintegration, ibid., 10–12.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

shuttling between the apparently hostile cultures. In the event that a renegade returned to his old home, there were fixed forms and rituals enabling his reintegration. When a former renegade suffered from his apostasy, it was possible, in England for instance, to have the reintegration take the form of a public religous ceremony creating a cathartic experience both for the individual and the community.[29] In Catholic countries the interrogations by the Inquisition served a similar function, and thus it was often the renegades who acted as mediators between the two apparently irreconcilable faiths.[30]

The reintegration practiced in early modern society did demand humility, however. And here was exactly where the problem lay for Olufs. The self-image he had built up as a hero would have suffered if he had admitted that he had converted to Islam. He would have had to give up the personal myth on which he had built his identity, since the admission would no longer have allowed him to appear as the shining hero in whose guise he had returned home. He would have had to subject himself inwardly to the ritual and his personality would have had to mature. However, his biography did not provide him with the wherewithal for such a task, since he became a slave at too young an age. The constant threat to his life had let him build up an identity that on the one hand integrated the dangerous conditions of his captivity and enabled him to rise up the social ladder, but on the other also demanded that the danger be repressed. Now he was expected to give up this identity and declare it sinful.

The reintegration of a former renegade was moreover a long, drawn-out process. Perhaps Olufs was too impatient, perhaps the duration of this process was not clear to him, for he seems to have forced his reintegration. As he had mastered his fate by force in North Africa, so he did once again at home. He got a girl pregnant, what is more, one who was alleged already to be engaged to someone else, according to Clement, Girre Nickelsen, who was then at sea.[31] In order to be able to marry his Antje, he had to be readmitted into the church. He thus forced his own readmission.

Hark Olufs was publicly confirmed in church, after he had been obliged to take instruction and try his faith the same as a normal catechist. He wore his Turkish uniform during this service. The priest, Nikolai Outzen, had the hymn "Du sagst, ich bin ein Christ" ("Thou sayest, I am a Christian") sung from the Tønder Hymnal.[32] This confirmation was still alive in people's memory in the

29. See Margo Todd, "A Captive's Story: Puritans, Pirates, and the Drama of Reconciliation," in *The Seventeenth Century* 12 (1997): 37–56. On the renegades see also Salvatore Bono, *I corsari barbareschi* (Turin, 1964), 249–66; Clissold, *Barbary Slaves*, 86–101.

30. See Bennassar/Bennassar, *Chrétiens*, 475.

31. Knut Jungbohn Clement, *Der Lappenkorb von Gabe Schneider aus Westfrisland, mit Zuthaten aus Nord-Frisland* (Leipzig, [1847]), 225, 227; Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 87 and n. 286.

32. *Vollständiges Gesang-Buch, in einer Sammlung Alter und Neuer Geistreichen Lieder, Der Gemeinde Gottes zu Tondern zur Beförderung der Andacht bey dem öffentlichen Gottes-Dienst, und besondern Hauss-Ubung gewidmet* (Tønder, 1731), no. 859, 1074–76. See Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 87, 90–92.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

mid-nineteenth century, even though no one was likely to have been aware of its true significance. It is reported, that Hark's father complained to the preacher about this hymn after the confirmation. And Clement was in 1847 of the opinion that the preacher had most certainly selected this hymn pointedly and rightly to torment the Gasnadal, because he suspected him of being a renegade or to have converted to Islam.[33] We can no longer determine whether Hark Olufs had already been confirmed before he went to sea.[34] Even if this was not the case, the type of ceremony suggests that the confirmation, which was necessary for his planned marriage, was intended as a purification and reintegration.

Johann Michael Kühn, who was also a slave in Algiers from 1725 to 1739 and was employed on a privateer against Christian ships during this period, had to declare publicly to the congregation before he was allowed to take part in Communion that he never in his life had ever wavered from the Christian faith. If we are to believe his own description, however, this was not so much demanded by the congregation as it was compelled by an inner need of his own:

> In the midst of all this outward tumult [he was received by the prince and "many great and respectable people"] I did not lose awareness of things of inward importance and my soul's salvation, to which end I chose a pious and courageous confessor under whose tutorship I wanted once again to become a good warrior in Jesus Christ, that is, Magister Avenarium, highly meritorious *Diaconum* at St. Margaret's, who brought me so far back that I was able to enjoy Holy Communion on January 9th, 1740, the first Sunday after Trinity, after previously assuring the congregation by the subsequent wording that I had never in my life deserted the Christian faith, on which occasion I also thanked all and everyone for their benevolent contribution to my ransom.[35]

In the case of Kühn, who served on an Algerian corsair, we could likewise wonder whether he did not indeed convert to Islam despite his repeated denials. At any rate, his experiences apparently affected him so deeply that he required special pastoral care. He not only felt gratitude, but perhaps also had a guilty conscience toward those who had contributed to his ransom.

Nonetheless, Kühn could find no inner peace in his home town of Gotha. After seven months, he left it again and went to Amsterdam. "Here," he writes, "I immediately found an opportunity to go to Surinam, a very famous Dutch colony, in Gviane in South America where the Surinam River flows into the Mar del Nord seven and one-half degrees from the equator, just a little northward, a place likened to an earthly paradise, where the Dutch have the most excellent sugar plantations, even if it please God to end my life here."[36]

33. Clement, *Lappenkorb*, 223f.
34. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 88 and n. 289.
35. Johann Michael Kühn, *Merckwürdige Lebens- und Reisebeschreibung [. . .]* (Gotha, 1741), 402–3.
36. Ibid., 408.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

Obviously, it was impossible for him to live within the confines of his hometown after having experienced things that burst the bounds of his normality. Not only did he miss the sea, "In a word, in Gotha was none of that element to be found, in which I could live,"[37] but by going far away, he was hoping to find people with similar experiences.

When Clement repeats the "rumor" that Olufs also wanted to leave and only stayed because he was "too conscientious" to leave the girl he had made pregnant,[38] then this shows that even in his own time people had difficulty understanding why Olufs stayed and what kept him. Clement did not realize that the general goal of the confirmation was to reintegrate Olufs into the community and renew his Christian faith. Even back then the past was less important to the community than the present. In this sense, the confirmation served as a compromise. The return to the bosom of the church by confirmation, the hymn "Thou sayest, I am a Christian" and the fact that Olufs wore his Turkish uniform for the occasion, combined all standpoints in a visible outward ritual and thus coped with them in this way for the community, just as a crime in early modern times was atoned by the ritual execution of banishment. This kind of rite, even the penalty itself, could be the result of verbal or nonverbal negotiations between the parties; in any case, it served to resolve the conflict.

The ritual[39] reflected the present situation and opened it simultaneously in the direction of a new future. In the sense of a rite of transition, it was accompanied by an inner and outer change: the return of the former slave and his reintegration. The standardized form led the repatriate back to the norms of the community and made these capable of being experienced emotionally in the ritual. Olufs's confirmation thus consciously aimed at evoking feelings and in the process, particularly because there was no prevailing agreement, to produce an experience of belonging together. In any case, the ritual helped to understand one's own history. It channeled the doubt by giving it a form and overcoming it in a religious sense through confirmation. Thus the situation was clarified by bringing Olufs formally back to Christianity — despite all doubts. The ritual of the church service was intended to reawaken the faith in Olufs. It was not at all inconceivable that the ritual might fail, especially if the pattern of culture on which it was based and which provided a logical meaning came into conflict with social change.[40] In any case, the experience of Olufs's confirmation was so great for relatives and the congregation that it was still remembered on Amrum more than one hundred years later, whether people understood the meaning or not.

37. Ibid.

38. Clement, *Lappenkorb*, 220.

39. On the importance of rituals in early modern times see Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1997), esp. 1–9.

40. See Clifford Geertz, *Dichte Beschreibung: Beiträge zum Verstehen kultureller Systeme* (Frankfurt am Main, 1983), 96–132.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

If we read the sixteen verses of the hymn "Thou sayest, I am a Christian" today,[41] we cannot quite understand the agitation it is said by Clement to have caused. It questions Olufs's Christian faith only when viewed superficially. It in no sense assumes an apostasy, but intends to strengthen the Christian faith by questioning the mere confession of being a Christian and instead calls for a Christian life — just the right hymn, you might say, for a perfectly normal confirmation intended to strengthen the faith and direct it toward the essentials.

The confirmation as such was, of course, still something relatively new on the island. Records of confirmations on Amrum are only found beginning in 1717,[42] and even then not every year. Not until 19 June 1736 was a new ordinance of the pietistic king, Christian VI, read out before the court (*Birkgericht*) of Westerlandföhr and Amrum, which made the confirmation of children following a public examination obligatory and prescribed in detail how the confirmation church service was to proceed.[43] In the opinion of Priest Outzen, it was also a matter of establishing the new ritual firmly on the island. The necessity of confirmation could well be demonstrated on Olufs, who had apparently not been confirmed before going to sea.

It will hardly have been the intent of the priest to have the island community understand the hymn as an accusation to the effect that Hark Olufs had converted to Islam; rather, these were the projections of his contemporaries. Should the priest have wanted to show his congregation primarily that true Christianity is demonstrated in daily life and practical deeds, not in a mere confession, then the main reason this was interpreted as a definitive doubt placed on Hark Olufs's faith was because the priest and the congregation had an entirely different background: the island population, adhering to traditional patterns of thought on the one hand, the seminary-educated theologian on the other. In spite, or perhaps because, of the articulated doubt, the confirmation enabled Olufs to keep living on his home island.

Hence the reintegration was not concluded with the confirmation, marriage and assumption of communal offices. From 1736 to 1739, Olufs's entire family, Hark himself, his wife, and his father, Oluf Jensen, refrained from taking part in Communion. Not until shortly before the death of Priest Outzen did Jensen again take Communion, as did Hark Olufs under the new priest, Mechlenburg. Clement interprets this as a deep conflict between the family and the priest, most probably as a consequence of the confirmation of the Gasnadal.[44]

However, not taking Communion could also have been connected to a feeling of unworthiness (something that Clement, writing in the mid-nineteenth

41. *Vollständiges Gesang-Buch*, no. 859, 1074–76.

42. Emil Hansen, *Geschichte der Konfirmation in Schleswig-Holstein bis zum Ausgang der rationalistischen Periode: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Konfirmation auf lutherischem Kirchengebiet* (Kiel, 1911), 351.

43. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 92 and n. 299.

44. Clement, *Lappenkorb*, 225–26; verified in the Amrum parish register.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

century as an enemy of the church,[45] was unable to understand). Olufs may have been outwardly reintegrated by his confirmation, but the inner reconciliation was not yet complete. By staying away from Communion, he made "the unrest in his heart publicly known,"[46] however, his relationship to the Amrum priests was in any case not as bad as Clement would like us to believe.

2. Pastoral Care

Olufs was a sought-after person to talk to. He repeatedly told of his experiences, and many stories based on his tales were still circulating on Amrum in the nineteenth century. In Tønder, he was even received by the Danish king, Christian VI, who, as Olufs writes, "was so kind as to listen to some of the things that had happened to me."[47] Tønder is located on the mainland not far from Amrum and was at that time part of the Duchy of Schleswig. Christian VI owned a palace there but stayed there only rarely according to his diaries (that have not survived in full); only one stay, in the year 1742, is certain. At the time, the king noted, "May 25th, Friday, we traveled from Gottorf to Tønder, [. . .] spent the evening at table inspecting the traditional costumes of the people of Sylt and Föhr who were in Tønder. May 26th, Saturday, we saw in the morning before we left Tønder [. . .] the people of Sylt and Föhr dancing."[48] On this occasion Olufs could also have been introduced to him along with the people from the neighboring islands of Sylt and Föhr.

But why was it so important to Olufs to tell of his experiences? Memories grow out of the "interior idiom" in which people talk to themselves.[49] This is at first private and would be difficult for others to understand, since it appears to be fragmentary, lacking in context and using special abbreviations. This interior idiom corresponds to the semiconscious flow of consciousness and forms a borderline area between the conscious and the unconscious from which fragments of memories emerge, but can also sink down again. The monologue of the interior idiom already helps to clarify and control one's own actions. In order to be understandable to others, however, it must be transformed into an "outer idiom" in narrative, which requires a previous process of structuring and

45. See Clement's invectives against the Amrum priests and the "Intoleranz des Kirchenglaubens seiner heimathlichen Insel," in his *Lappenkorb*, 221, 230.

46. See David W. Sabean, *Das zweischneidige Schwert: Herrschaft und Widerspruch im Württemberg der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990), 51–76, here 69.

47. Olufs 1751, 47.

48. P. Brock, "Kong Christian den Sjettes Dagbøger for Aarene 1741–1744," in *Danske Samlinger for Historie, Topografi, Personal- og Literaturhistorie* II, 4 (1874–76): 262–323, here 286.

49. On the interior and exterior idiom see Erentraud Wild, *Inneres Sprechen — äussere Sprache: Psycholinguistische Aspekte einer Didaktik der schriftlichen Sprachverwendung* (Stuttgart, 1980), 63–85, 89–109. The interior idiom was discovered by Jean Piaget when doing research on the soliloquies of children; see Jean Piaget, *Sprechen und Denken des Kindes* (3rd ed., Düsseldorf, 1976). See also: Lew Semjonowitsch Wygotski, *Denken und Sprechen* (Frankfurt am Main, 1977), esp. 40, 311–51.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

additional awareness. This process is then carried one step further from the narrated to the written idiom, or alternatively, writing it down can be a conscious attempt to give it structure.

Hence narrative provides a structure for experience, gives it order and fills it with meaning. Narrative psychology even goes so far as to assert that this is the only way in which identity is possible. The various episodes are put into a framework that gives them meaning and in this way they gain significance. As long as experience remains within the range of the normal, this happens in part unconsciously, in part consciously, and a prenarrational conception nourished by cultural tradition and experienced sequences is reflexively examined again and again.[50] In this sense, identity is constantly developing; it must be seen as being progressive, as Dan McAdams writes, so that we, in our search for unity and a purpose to our lives, make progress throughout the years starting from adolescence.[51]

The lack of inner bonding, of a fixed value structure, must have posed a psychological problem for Hark Olufs. Without a goal, without a situation demanding a definitive decision such as that to which he had become accustomed in Algeria, he could have found no lasting fulfillment on Amrum. This is why telling his experiences and later writing them down served an important function in his reintegration. This helped him to find a common thread to run through the *Return* and thus enabled him to stay on the island and to discover a fixed place of peace in his native land.

In Olufs's case, however, the experiences were so unusual that the culturally prescribed plots normally used by a narrative were no longer sufficient. In order to come to grips with his experiences, it was thus not enough to tell them over and over again himself. Instead, Olufs needed someone to help him to structure them. And priests seem to have taken over this task, at first perhaps the Amrum preachers, Outzen and Mechlenburg, but above all, Otto Riese.

Since 1729–1730, Riese (1697–1779) had been chaplain with his father, who was priest in Agerskov in northern Schleswig and provost of the Norderrangstrup district. In 1738, following his father, he was called to be a preacher in Agerskov; in 1760 he became, like his father, provost of the district. Hence he was there not only as a theologian, but also as the brother-in-law of both the Amrum priest Nikolai Hansen Outzen (1732–1739) as well as of his successor Friedrich Marstrand Mechlenburg (1739–1778), who married his predecessor's widow. His acquaintance with Hark Olufs will likely have arisen

50. See Donald E. Polkinghorne, "Narrative Psychologie und Geschichtsbewusstsein: Beziehungen und Perspektiven," in: *Erzählung, Identität und historisches Bewusstsein: Die psychologische Konstruktion von Zeit und Geschichte*, ed. Jürgen Straub (Frankfurt am Main, 1998), 12–45.

51. Dan P. McAdams, *Das bin ich: Wie persönliche Mythen unser Selbstbild formen* (Hamburg, 1996), 117.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

from these family relations extending to Amrum.[52] Riese, who occupied his free time with physical experiments and, in the 1760s, under the pseudonym of "Orthophilus," carried on a controversial dispute with the neighboring priest on the truth of the Copernican system, was well-read and interested in matters of the world, that is to say, he was also interested in Olufs's experiences in Africa. Hence he also took note of things of importance to cultural history in the Agerskov parish register.[53]

The actions of the orthodox Lutheran priests in particular are today often seen in a negative light, as if they were only interested in proving the importance of the Christian faith, and as if the faith they served was only intended for outward show. Olufs's case could be seen in this light, when we read the Christian foreword and the ending of the memoirs, in which Olufs compares his fate to that of Joseph and prays to God for grace "which has kept me through many dangers up to this hour" in order now to spend the rest of his days "far from the trouble and strife of this world, in peace, faith and trust in Him."[54] Then Olufs's confession would have been the end of the priest's mission, and the autobiography would be no more than a complacent testimony to the priest's success.

A ministry that relates illness, death, family and marital problems to psychological crises and various cases of conflict is actually a development of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In Lutheran orthodoxy, the ecclesiastical office serves primarily to spread the Word and administer sacraments. "Special ministry" primarily referred to worthiness for Communion and this often served church discipline. It usually took place in the form of the confession that preceded Communion, or in the form of private admonitions whenever the pastor learned of a sin.[55] Priest Outzen would not have done much more with Hark Olufs, and perhaps Olufs is missing from the rolls of the confessants because the priest refused him Communion on the grounds that he was untaught or living in sin. The Pietist August Hermann Francke, for instance, did not allow anyone to take Communion who was suing someone else for slander, since he was of the opinion that "such proceedings do not rhyme at all with Christianity."[56] In Pietism, as well, which preferred private instruction to public sermons, even ministry to the ill and infirm took the form of admonition,

52. See Wilhelm Henningsen, "Ueber die kirchlichen Verhältnisse der Nordseeinsel Amrum sowie ihre evang.-luth. Geistlichen und ihre Familien," in *Jahrbuch des Heimatbundes Nordfriesland* 22 (1935): 145–159, here 153; Otto Fr. Arends, *Gejstligheden i Slesvig og Holsten fra Reformationen til 1864* (Copenhagen, 1932), 2:65, 129, 202; 3:100–1, 108.

53. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 102–3.

54. Olufs 1751, 48.

55. On pastoral care in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries see Karl Schmerl, *Die specielle Seelsorge in der lutherischen Kirche unter der Orthodoxie und dem Pietismus* (Nürnberg, 1893); Endre Zsindely, *Krankheit und Heilung im älteren Pietismus* (Zürich, 1962), 154–75.

56. Quote from Schmerl, *Seelsorge*, 115.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

prayer, confession, and Communion. It was a matter of "saving the soul," and the goal of the minister was to get the soul into Heaven. This kind of resolution requires this life to be oriented toward the next, a belief that came down from the Middle Ages. The "soul" was in this sense not identical with what we today refer to as the "psychological makeup," but was instead a type of eternal second body that lived on after death.[57] A psychological makeup in the modern sense did not become possible until the orientation toward the next life lost its importance and life was seen more and more as worldly. The distinction between conscious and unconscious, as expressed by Sigmund Freud, took the place of the old dichotomies of body and soul, Heaven and Earth. Reaching this view involved a long process, which in the end built upon the rationalistic philosophy of René Descartes (1596–1650), for whom consciousness first gained crucial importance in the famous dictum "cogito ergo sum," and the dualistic division into a thinking and a bodily substance (*res cogitans vs. res extensa*).

Otto Riese was not a born-again Pietist, indeed, the Pietists in his community considered him to be "spiritually dead." He was said to have no compassion for humanity's state of damnation. Although he may have seen that life in his community was going awry and that his statements could indeed awaken people, he did not know how to make people aware of the true Gospel, it was claimed.[58]

The purely practical purpose of faith is to help suffering humanity. In the idiom and through the means of the Christian religion, ministers in early modern times often did nothing different from what a psychotherapist does today. In the seventeenth century, Christian Kortholt, a seminary student and later professor, had a boy who was possessed by demons learn a hymn by heart in order to bring him back to communication with his fellow beings,[59] and even Priest Riese functioned as a minister to Olufs. His intention was not only to save his soul, but apparently also to give Olufs an inner peace that would allow him to live in his native land once again after the ruptures and dreadful experiences making up his biography. A way could be found if Olufs had clung to his Christian faith in his heart, despite his formal conversion to Islam, as many other renegades had claimed to have done at least after the event. Riese therefore elaborated on the steadfastness of faith enduring beyond the experiences in North Africa (which in the end must be understood as an act of confirmation in the faith). He listened to the story, posed questions, suggested interpretations

57. On the psychological makeup see Peter Dinzelbacher, ed., *Europäische Mentalitätsgeschichte: Hauptthemen in Einzeldarstellungen* (Stuttgart, 1993), 160–86.

58. Jonas Brodersen, *Fra gamle Dage: Det kristelige Livs Vækkelse og Vækst i Nordslesvig fra Begyndelsen af Brødremenighedens Mission til henimod Midten af 19. Aarhundrede* (Copenhagen, 1912), 201.

59. Martin Rheinheimer, "Professor Kortholt und der besessene Knabe oder: Der Historiker, das historische Subjekt und die Fallen der Subjektivität," in: *Subjektive Welten: Wahrnehmung und Identität in der Neuzeit*, ed. Martin Rheinheimer (Neumünster, 1998), 11–49, here 44.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

that Olufs could use as his own and that fit the Christian world, thus allowing him to return to this world by way of the words of his autobiography. Ironically, it was Clement himself who, by defending Olufs and transforming him into a war hero, allowed the doubt to survive. Riese, who as a minister should have been critical, let Olufs emerge out of his memories as a Christian braced and fortified in the faith. He had Olufs's soul at heart, not his heroic deeds.

In the case of the Norwegian Lars Diderich, who spent more than five years as a slave in Morocco from 1749 to 1754, the process of ministry can be clearly seen from the nature of his memories. He too had often told of his experiences and had also been encouraged to write them down, but he did not consider himself capable, either because he was lacking the literary skill, or because the traumatic memories would have overwhelmed him psychologically. In his foreword, he writes that he would not have made the book "so accommodating and edifying [. . .], as it must be," but that this was not the result of a lack of expressive skills with regard to literary or theological ability, but relates to his psychological state as well. Then a "good friend" was found who wrote down the stories as Diderich told them. He wrote the memoirs in the form of a dialogue between a Theophilus and a Timotheus, in which, as the subtitle of the book announces, Theophilus represents the "historical truth," which Timotheus uses for "the edification of pious devotion." The book thus was intended to serve as an "edifying mirror" for every Christian. The extremely edifying and theological character of the writing clearly points to a theologian as author, i.e., a minister in this case as well. The interplay of theological issues and narrational answers, however, was not only intended to "effect edification in sensible readers," as it says in the foreword, but doubtlessly also served to help Diderich come to grips with his past. The friend intentionally built up a counter-world that allowed the former slave an inner dissociation and return. In doing so, though, the friend created a book with which Diderich could hardly identify at first, so that he had to be persuaded by theological arguments to publish the historical narrative under his own name. The friend — who is not named in the book — then wanted to render account of "the theology he had written." In the end, Diderich liked the book so well that he agreed. However, he also actively accepted the ministerial actions expressed in the book in order to pass on the mediated faith to his fellows out of gratefulness for his own liberation.[60]

The effect of the talks was a sort of brainwashing using subtle means,[61] which served the further confirmation of Olufs's Christian faith. The separation from

60. Lars Diderich, *Sandfærdig Fortællelse Om De Christnes ynkværdig Slaverie udi Barbariet, i sær hos den Maroccanske Keyser, med noget angaaende Folkets Religion, Regierings-Form, Skikke og Leve-Maade, etc.* (Copenhagen, 1756), 5–6.

61. On the steps of a brainwash procedure see Baumeister, *Identity*, 233–45.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

social contacts and bonds in North Africa favored the purposeful destruction of his old identity, but the acceptance of a new identity also had to be accompanied by the creation of new relationships. He had to internalize his old life as being sinful and wrong, and the priest had to awaken in him a desire to change, since active participation was necessary for the process to be successful. Finally, Olufs had to internalize as well the idiom of the new faith system in order to take on its values. This is made quite clear in the foreword and ending to his memoirs, where Olufs places his fate within the landscape of Christian salvation: "Since it pleased God to lead me, before many thousands of other people, in so remarkable a way, I have been asked to write down the strange events that happened to me, because they were so noteworthy, and to have them printed in order that the same might serve in the future as testimony to how marvelously God leads the children of men, and that He is able to move even the heart of a heathen to mercy according to His grace."[62] Not until he was able to take this step out of inner conviction and these words signified more to him than a mere topos was the process concluded.

While brainwashing replaces the old identity entirely, Olufs was able to maintain a certain continuity, perhaps he was even able for the first time in his life to construct the basis for such a continuity. His experiences in the foreign world were consciously reinterpreted and provided with a meaning that made Olufs fit again for the Christian world. In the course of the talks, which in the end led to the writing of Olufs's memoirs, the various discourses in which Olufs and his native community were involved once again became adapted to one another.

3. The Autobiography

In 1747, Hark Olufs's autobiography was published in Copenhagen.[63] Since he had difficulty writing it, whether due to a lack of literary skill or due to his traumas, Otto Riese wrote down the memoirs as Olufs related them[64] and had them printed in order that they could attest to God's grace. This text was written in Danish, as were all of Riese's texts. The book contains a mixture of memories, adventure stories, and travel reports.

Writing the book called for a final structuring and formed the last milestone in Olufs's reintegration. The selection and arrangement of the episodes related in it is not accidental, but subsumed under the all-embracing theme: the liberation from slavery.[65] The task of the Christian topoi in the foreword and the

62. Olufs 1751, 3 and 47–48. The "heathen" in this case refers to the Bey setting him free.

63. *Harck Olufs, Fød paa Øen Amrom udi Riber-Stift i Jydland, Besynderlige Avantures, som have tildraget sig med ham Især til Constantine og paa andre Steder i Africa, For deres Merkværdigheds skyld i Trykken udgivne* (Copenhagen, 1747).

64. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 110 and n. 367.

65. On the importance of narrative structuring see Polkinghorne, "Narrative Psychologie," 12–45.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

ending is to situate the story in the interpretive contexts of the time. They thus develop Olufs's personal drama and bring it to its end. Following the capture, it is necessary to know something about the country to which he was taken in order to understand what it meant to be held captive. Olufs's extraordinary career at the court of the Bey of Constantine is important because it made possible his later release, since all attempts of his father to ransom him had failed. The two adventures that are told in such detail in the main section first (the war with Sheikh Bu Aziz) lead to his further career, which reaches its climax in the middle of the book, and then (the war against the Bey of Tunis) to the promise of his release. After additional descriptions of the country that serve to slow down the narrative whose foreignness emphasizes the significance of Olufs's own accomplishment, the release and the homecoming can then follow, although the futile efforts of his father are not mentioned until the end and obtain their meaning from the actual return of the son. Within this structure, not a single episode is superfluous or long-winded; instead, the book is limited to the absolute necessities to achieve its purpose.

The character types from which Olufs forms his concept of himself are at first glance rather undifferentiated. He himself dominates his memoirs as their hero; only seldom do more mature reflections appear. However, when he speaks of the motivation for his heroic deeds,[66] he does indeed provide clues to his real inner ego, which in those years deviated considerably from the outer one. There are isolated glimpses that allow us to see the ambiguity of his former existence and his true emotions. We should not underestimate the importance of these scenes, however, as does Ruhe, who considers them as merely subordinated to purposes of justification. He thereby assumes a conscious motivation after Olufs's return that is diametrically opposed, owing to the changed situation regarding interests, to the equally conscious motivation during the time in North Africa.[67] Such motives may possibly have played a part during the writing, but even people in early modern times did not function on such a simple level, but were complex beings with several levels of interwoven motivation. The dominance of the war hero is the idealized and personified result of Olufs's attempt to reconcile the conflicting *imagines*[68] of his concept of himself — as son, sailor, war hero, Christian.

Although the autobiography at first reading appears plain and conventional, there is method in its composition. Around a center (adventure and career), depictions of the country in the manner of travel reports are arranged, and these in turn are framed by biographical information preceding the account (origin,

66. Olufs 1751, 13–14.

67. See Ernstpeter Ruhe, "Christensklaven als Beute nordafrikanischer Piraten: Das Bild des Maghreb im Europa des 16.-19. Jahrhunderts," in *Europas islamische Nachbarn: Studien zur Literatur und Geschichte des Maghreb*, ed. Ernstpeter Ruhe, (Würzburg, 1993), 1:159–86, here 168–70.

68. This term is explained in McAdams, *Das bin ich*, 130–31.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

capture) or following it (release, homecoming). The foreword and ending are grouped around these accounts, with topical references to the Bible and the integration of the biography itself into the topography of Christian salvation.

As a rule, when the authors did not come from the educated classes, two people, and thus two discourses, were involved in the making of travel reports: 1) the traveler himself, who brought back his experiences of the journey and was situated in the (oral) discourse of his class, in Olufs's case, the class of seafarers; 2) a person who organizes this experience in such a way that it can also be conveyed to people and brought to market.[69] One reason was that the travelers, especially those returning from slavery, usually lacked the ability to express themselves in writing. Even Marco Polo drew on the help of a professional writer.[70] Owing to this help from educated persons, the two discourses were brought closer to one another. Two levels came together, and it is often difficult or even impossible to tell them apart in the text. The process of asking questions and writing could also change the experience itself and its interpretation, causing what happened to be seen quite differently in the end. Hence this process could lead to the creation of a new truth, perhaps more accommodating, but in any case a truth that was easier to sell, which spoke to the hopes and fears of the readers and at the same time also fulfilled the intentions of the helper.

In the mid-sixteenth century, the memoirs of Hans Staden were already honed by the fact that Professor Dryander provided him with a number of questions that appeared in the text as chapter headings. In this way, he helped him more explicitly to differentiate and distinguish the world he had experienced and suffered through from his own and at the same time clarified and confirmed for the repatriate the fact that he now again belongs to his own world.[71]

As these discourses became interwoven, the special character of autobiographies also played a part. The repatriates had generally already told their (hi)stories many times over before they wrote them down or had them written (in some cases at the urging of their audience). Repeating the story set the form of the episodes, which made a particularly good impression on the audience, sometimes in the sense of amplifying or supplementing them, perhaps also of reinterpreting them and reading another meaning into them. The authors reacted to questions and in doing so consciously or unconsciously adopted the point of view of their audience. Both Olufs as well as Kühn and Jacobsen were helped by educated persons (Olufs and Jacobsen by priests),[72] so that the latter's point of view could also find its way into the narrative, which perforce caused

69. Michael Harbsmeier, *Wilde Völkerkunde: Andere Welten in deutschen Reiseberichten der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1994), 120.

70. Ibid., 39.

71. Ibid., 115.

72. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 107 and n. 358. For the edition of travel reports also refer to Roelof van Gelder, *Het Oost-Indisch avontuur: Duitsers in dienst van de VOC (1600–1800)* (Nijmegen, 1997), 253–60. He also stresses their reintregative importance (ibid., 286).

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

the discourses to flow together on the one hand, while on the other producing a generally acceptable "public" point of view. This intellectual assimilation of the discourses was already a factor influencing the reintegration of the travelers into the European world. Under certain circumstances, it was motivated by commercial considerations alone; for a travel report or an autobiography to be written, two things first had to be present: the inner drive to write it and a market of potential readers. The inner drive could result from the need to come to grips with the incidents. Commercial success required the product to appeal to the needs of readers.

The experiences of the travelers were adapted to the discourse of potential readers by means of a kind of "cultural purification process," in which the experiences and the discourse of the sailors were adapted to the discourse of their European readers. The seafarers had already experienced slavery through the prism of a discourse nourished by a mixture of hearsay with a derivate of existing literature. Their stories enriched these stereotypes by adding their own experiences and adventures. The purification process now took up the topoi of the literature and the needs of the audience and made the individual experiences and stories of the former slaves conform to them. In this way, they were conducted back into an educated, literary world. By being thus filled with life, the cultural stereotypes and topoi simultaneously acquired a fixed form, even if the individual experience burst their bounds.[73]

If Kortholt intended to prove the existence of the Devil with a piece of writing that he set down many years after the events had occurred, and if Riese perhaps intended to show others the miraculous ways in which God works in order to strengthen their faith, then practical ministry nonetheless took priority above these theological intentions. By generating a personal mythos, a coherent story out of Olufs's disparate memories, perhaps in the course of many talks, Otto Riese not only situated Olufs as a wanderer between two worlds, but also reintegrated him into the one to which he had returned. The otherness of his experiences was integrated through the medium of the travel report. The narrative created a mutual bond between listener and narrator, between the non-traveler and the traveler, between the repatriate with his extraordinary experiences and the stay-at-home who lacked them. In particular, the emphasis placed on being a Christian created "a community with regard to communication and located in one's own world, which is spoken *to* as it is listening or reading, in contrast to other people and worlds, which are spoken *about* or described."[74] The North African world of Olufs's past became the counterworld he could use to rediscover his Christian identity and find a connection

73. The consequences are explained by Martin Rheinheimer, "Identität und Kulturkonflikt: Selbstzeugnisse schleswig-holsteinischer Sklaven in den Barbareskenstaaten," in *Historische Zeitschrift* 269 (1999): 317–369, here 365–369.

74. See Harbsmeier, *Wilde Völkerkunde*, 23.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

to his present and future on Amrum. Hence dissociation, reinterpretation, and inner return became possible for Olufs himself. Rising above all ruptures, an inner unity and continuity was elaborated that made something similar to an "ego identity" possible.[75]

Riese gave Olufs the script that gave meaning to his past. In such cases, as Polkinghorne stresses, narrative structuring operates dialectically: it works with memory to revive past occurrences and it works in the service of making fables to create coherence and unity. As a result, the remembered, imagined representations making up the retrospective story are not mere replicas of the former occurrences as they originally took place.[76] We must not expect a historically "objective" presentation, but rather that Olufs orientated his experiences toward a plot (release from slavery) and compressed them into specific episodes that could best express the meaning of what he had experienced. This is why there is much that he left out and why he, in certain situations (I am thinking particularly of the two adventures related in such detail), included what did not happen in that situation (but may have in another), or which articulated a desire or fear. Ruhe considers his report to be an apology with which he intended to clear himself of the accusation of having failed to play the martyr in the hands of cruel enemies of the Faith. His entire interpretation is assumed to be subordinated to the goal of coming across as the good Christian at home, and this is the only reason he pretended to repent of his crimes.[77]

Even though we know that the same situation may be perceived quite differently by different persons, we must nonetheless accept what Olufs writes as true — *in dubio pro reo*. For *him* at least, it took on a subjective truth in the telling. He desired this truth and wanted to be measured by it. And thus it became his truth, a truth he could live with, and which enabled him to live with his deeds ("For I massacred many on order and many without orders, and, being entrusted with all kinds of tasks during the remaining years, I had total power over life and death.")[78] Thus Olufs created his own mythos, as we can still read on his gravestone: "Here lies the great war hero. . ."[79]

4. Missing Reintegration and Collective Assimilation

The part played by Olufs's family must not be underestimated. His father was still alive and an influential man on his home island when his son returned. We will see him act in the background at all further stages of development. His confirmation and marriage marked the beginning of Hark Olufs's reintegration.

75. The term "ego identity" is explained by Erikson, *Identität*, 107, 123 and following.
76. Polkinghorne, "Narrative Psychologie," 24–25.
77. Ruhe, "Christensklaven," 169–70.
78. Olufs 1751, 29.
79. Rheinheimer, *Der fremde Sohn*, 6–8.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

Since he did not go to sea again, he was not only present on the island, in contrast to the other men of his age, but he also had quite a lot of time. Hence he could assume municipal offices and was at least for a while a member of the local board (*Achtmann*) for the village communities of Nebel and Süddorf on Amrum. There is evidence of his serving in this office in the years 1744 and 1753, and he may well also have occupied it in 1738.[80] The members of the local board were responsible for overseeing the common land and making sure that the village bylaws were adhered to. In this capacity, he read out an order of the court (*Birkgericht*) at Süddorf according to which no one was allowed to pay tuition to the teacher Jakob Hansen until he had settled accounts with Hans Christian Schlachter in Wyk on Föhr.[81] He also occasionally represented single women from the neighborhood in court as trustee, as he did from 1744 to 1746 in a protracted suit for Krassen Christians, the widow of Christian Peters.[82] Moreover, he also gave this woman a loan of 200 marks.[83] Once, in 1741, he was himself summoned as a witness in a suit concerning oysters caught illegally.[84]

Furthermore, Olufs was shore leaseholder from 1742 to 1744 and 1751–1752. This office, which was auctioned to the highest bidder for three years, was a good investment on the North Frisian islands, since the shore leaseholders received a fixed proportion of the goods salvaged when a ship ran aground.[85] In those cases it was every man for himself. Accordingly, Olufs summoned three men to court in the course of 1744 because they had misappropriated stranded goods. The suits remained unsuccessful, however, because neither the witnesses nor the defendants appeared in court on the dates set, and finally Olufs himself no longer turned up, so that the matter came to nothing in the end.[86] Conversely, he was himself taken to court in 1745 by Jan Boysen, a shipmaster from Sylt, because he refused "to give the same, in return for a fair salvage fee, some of the goods and equipment salvaged from the ships which were involved in an accident in the year 1743 and managed by his proprietor."[87]

80. For the years 1744 and 1753: LAA Retsbetjentarkiver, tillæg 3, f. 90r-99v; ibid., 4, f. 142v. For 1738 see Clement, *Lappenkorb*, 216. The parish accounts he mentions are not available. For the tasks of the municipal officials refer to the Amrum village bylaws: Martin Rheinheimer, *Die Dorfordnungen im Herzogtum Schleswig: Dorf und Obrigkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 1999), 2: 542–49.

81. LAA Retsbetjentarkiver, tillæg 3, f. 87v.

82. Ibid., f. 100v-101r, 139v, 155v.

83. Ibid., 14, 361–62.

84. Ibid., 2, f. 175r.

85. On the North Frisian flotsam and jetsam regulations see: Bert Kelm, "Strandinger ved Rømø i 1700-tallet," in *Sønderjyske årbøger* 1997, 59–88; Hedvig Beck, *Mandø i 1700-tallet* (Esbjerg, 1999), 52–60.

86. LAA Retsbetjentarkiver, tillæg 3, f. 77v-78r, 82r-83v, 85r.

87. Ibid., f. 120r; see ibid., f. 139r.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

Thanks to these public offices, Olufs was able to reinforce his position in local society. As a lawsuit from the year 1744 shows however, his position was not unassailable. In September 1744, both the entire village communities of Nebel and Süddorf as well as Hark Olufs personally brought charges against a certain Sönke Knudten of Nebel before the court of Westerland-Föhr and Amrum. In the house of Georg Quedensen, "words had been exchanged" between the members of the local board (among them Hark Olufs) and Sönke Knudten on September 5. Jürgen Knudten, Jürgen Oldis, and Peter Schwennen, who were present, were summoned to court as witnesses. Apparently they were not eager to have anything to do with the case, since they did not arrive until two dates set by the court had passed. On October 20, finally, they testified. Apparently it was a matter of unpaid grazing fees which the court assessors had penalized by seizing lambs. Jürgen Knudten testified as to the causes: "Sönke Knudten had said to Hark Olufs that he had taken Sönke Knudten's lambs from the land, because he had not given any money, now he had . . . paid the money and his lambs were gone, whether this was right, he didn't know." At this juncture the dispute escalated and Sönke Knudten called Hark Olufs "an old whoreson." Now all the witnesses testified that most of those present were "drunken" or "a bit tipsy." Peter Schwennen added, "Hark Olufs told Sönke Knudten, he should be ashamed."[88]

Hark Olufs showed himself to be well acquainted with the legal tricks in the case. Apparently he had appointed the witnesses at the scene, then obtained an attestation of their testimonies and insistently summoned his opponent, who tried to avoid a direct confrontation and did not appear in court even after being summoned three times. In this way, Olufs won the case, burdened Knudten with the court costs by means of a petition and restored his honor. On December 15 the verdict was issued "that the words indicated of an old whoreson neither can nor should in any way taint the name of the plaintiff, Hark Olufs; since, however, the same are unseemly and inadmissible, Sönke Knudten should, for his crime, immediately pay two talers to the poor-relief fund on Amrum, refund the costs accrued to the plaintiff of seven marks and pay two marks and ten pfennigs to the justice fund."[89]

In libel suits in early modern times, not only were conflicts between the generations settled (for this reason, the village in early modern times has been said to have had an utterly "agonistic culture"),[90] but the social position of individuals was also determined. The fact that Hark Olufs reacted so aggressively to the insults of a drunk is probably related to the fact that his honor was still considered dubious, if only tacitly. Hence the witnesses were not eager to testify in his

88. Ibid., f. 93r-94r; see ibid., f. 90r-99v.

89. Ibid., f. 99v.

90. Rainer Walz, "Agonale Kommunikation im Dorf der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Westfälische Forschungen* 42 (1992): 215–51.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

defense. Olufs had to use every means at his disposal to prevent any discussion of and every direct charge to his person in order to maintain his position on Amrum. This is why he had the court establish, through the witnesses, that the lambs were the cause of the dispute — this outwardly removed any grounds for the "old whoreson." Olufs showed in this lawsuit that he would not condone such charges, and indeed anything like this did not occur again.

On 13 October 1754, Olufs died at the age of 46 on Amrum. Five days after his sudden death he was buried in the cemetery in Nebel. His relatives donated a wax candle to the church, and Priest Mechlenburg noted his death in the parish register in these brief words: "On October 18 Hark Olufs was laid to rest in his forty-seventh year. The church was given a wax candle. March 10, 1724 captured, October 31, 1735 released, April 25, 1736 arrived home, conjugated in the summer of 1737, blessed with one son and four daughters, that is, together for eighteen years."[91]

The family hired Tai Hinrichs of Lüttmoor on the Hallig Nordstrandischmoor to make a gravestone. Hinrichs had already made one out of sandstone for Hark's father Oluf Jensen († 1750) some years before, and probably one for Knut Ercken († 1750) as well.[92] Ercken had also spent fourteen years in slavery. All these gravestones are still standing in the cemetery in Nebel. Olufs's stone, 110 cm high and 70 cm wide, is made of fine, grey sandstone, and bears a long inscription. Gravestones such as this one the family had made for him, with pictures, a complete biography and a poem on the back, were extraordinarily expensive in those days.[93] They were only put up if people thought something could be gained by it.

In the form of Oluf Jensen's and Hark Olufs's gravestones, his family raised a monument intended to present that truth which the family, faced with his death, desired to be seen by one and all. The autobiography and the gravestones created a family tradition which, particularly in view of Olufs's relatively early death, provided support and strengthened the cohesion of the family and the community on the island, beset as they were by the dangers of seafaring. While other captains' gravestones primarily documented their affluence, Olufs's stone also had the character of an appeal: in this case, it told of his widow and his small children in a potentially hostile environment. Olufs's past suffering in slavery was now cited to muster help for present needs; in view of his death, all doubt about his character had to be put to rest. In this way, the autobiography and the gravestone — like so many other "ego" documents — took on the function of providing meaning and cohesion.

91. Parish archive Nebel/Amrum, parish register 1710–1779.

92. See Theodor Möller, *Der Kirchhof in Nebel auf Amrum und seine alten Grabsteine* (Neumünster, 1928), 68, 72, 74.

93. Ibid., 49.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

Hark Olufs continued to occupy the thoughts of the people on Amrum even after he died; indeed, he now became even more mysterious to them. His ghost was said to appear most often at night on a hillock between Nebel, where the cemetery was located, and Süddorf, where his house stood. In the mid-nineteenth century, people on the island were still telling the following tale:

> Hark Olufs, born on Amrum, was captured by pirates on the Mediterranean Sea, sold as a slave in Algiers and thus came to serve Bey Assin of Constantine. He served loyally as his treasurer and general for twelve years, and triumphed over the Bey of Tunis in a great battle. Then he received permission to return to his native land, and spent the rest of his life living on Amrum off the treasures he had collected in the land of the Turks. After his death, however, he could find no peace in his grave. Each night he roamed in his shroud on Hochstiän ("High Rock"), a hillock between the village of Nebel, with its church, and Süddorf, where he had lived, and for a long time no one dared to ask the ghost what was wrong. Finally, someone did. Then he answered that he had buried most of the treasures he had brought with him from the land of the Turks beneath the threshold of the door to his house in Süddorf without telling his heirs. This was what was disturbing his peace of mind. When they dug up the threshold, they found a big pot filled to the brim with gold. The treasure was retrieved and divided up among the heirs. And from that time on his soul was at peace and his ghost was never seen again.[94]

At first glance, this legend appears to be a typical ghost story; a hidden treasure unknown to the heirs is considered an archetypal reason for a person to return from the dead.[95] The Amrum legend is thus based on an established motif. Moreover, the envy of the people on Amrum is certain to have played a part in the birth of this legend; after all, while Hark Olufs returned from slavery as a rich man, other families had been obliged to face ruin in order to ransom a member of their family. But no one could say how much money he had really brought back. He may well have been imagined to have much greater riches than he actually did.

Above all, though, this legend addresses the doubt over whether or not Hark Olufs had converted to Islam. Overcoming this doubt would require not so much a suspicion of conversion, but rather his way of dealing with the past, his denial and the conspicuous silence on the subject that always occurs just where his memoirs get interesting, his lack of emotions and genuine repentance. His soul was assumed to have been unable to find peace. Thus the legend served the community by restoring the disrupted order of things. The treasure revealed by

94. Karl Müllenhoff, *Sagen, Märchen und Lieder der Herzogtümer Schleswig, Holstein und Lauenburg: Neue Ausgabe besorgt von Otto Mensing* (Schleswig, 1921), 194, no. 289. The compilation was first published in Kiel in 1845. Clement, *Lappenkorb*, 226–27, also mentions this legend.

95. Hanns Bächtold-Stäubli, ed., *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, (Berlin, 1938/41), 9: 573.

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

the dead man symbolizes faith and the feelings, the childhood fears, to which Olufs — in the eyes of the people of Amrum — had been unable to gain access during his life. The outward ritual of confirmation and the autobiography had created a compromise which allowed life to go on; confronted with eternity, the conflict erupted once again. The legend projected Olufs's internal conflict outward, turned it into a story and in this way articulated what was unspoken. In death, his private conflict became the community's. The collective now took over the task of dealing with this conflict in the face of eternity and helped him to find peace at last by asking what was wrong. Not until he was dead was Olufs able, by revealing the treasure, to break his own silence and speak, to rediscover the ability to communicate that he had lacked in life. And only in this way was the community able to make its peace with him. At the same time, Hark Olufs became a part of the island's collective memory.

Conclusion

In the early modern period, a renegade who returned home had to undergo certain rites and fulfill certain demands in order to be successfully reintegrated. These rites had to be accomplished internally as well as externally. The case of Hark Olufs, who returned to his Lutheran parish in the eighteenth century, shows that it is possible to identify three levels involved in this sort of reintegration: 1) He had to undergo a formal religious rite to make his reassimilation externally visible. The rite employed for this purpose was that of confirmation, commonly reserved for youths of around fifteen years of age, before they were considered full members of the community. 2) In order to deal with his apostasy and return internally, Hark Olufs submitted to a type of religious counseling that can be considered to be a precursor of modern psychotherapy. This culminated in the publication of an autobiography. By writing this book together with his counselor, he created a personal mythos that repressed his apostasy and made it seem as if returning home had been the objective of all his actions. 3) Apart from religious and psychological reintegration, his social reintegration was also important. This involved getting married, assuming official functions in the local society, and creating a family tradition. In this he was aided by the fact that his father was an influential person in his home parish. Apparently, the interaction of all three levels was important for the success of his reintegration. Another factor that was advantageous to his successful reintegration was the fact that his home was a seafaring community in which many men had already gained familiarity with foreign cultures. Nonetheless, Hark Olufs's position in society following his return was never entirely uncontested. After his death the parish mastered the questioning of the collective identity by means of a legend.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN DENMARK, ESBJERG

This content downloaded from 144.173.6.94 on Fri, 15 Jul 2016 16:08:40 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms